

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Applicant again respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of all certified copies of the priority documents.

Claim 19 has been amended to correct a minor informality.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being made "obvious" by a proposed combination of Tsutsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,910) and Bussan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,474).

Applicant traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

With respect to claim 1, Tsutsui et al. and Bassan et al., taken either alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose controlling the notification device as claimed.

In particular, claim 1 describes that, in a state in which an incoming-call detector has detected a new incoming-call signal from a first line, when the status discriminator discriminates a call holding status for a second line, a controller controls a notification device so that an incoming call is notified by, at least, tone information. When the status discriminator discriminates an on-call status for the second line, the controller controls the notification device so that an incoming call is notified by, at least, visible information.

The office action acknowledges that Tsutsui et al. fails to disclose an incoming call detector or a notification means. See 8/17/2008 Office Action, page 2. Bussan et al. is cited as allegedly remedying this deficiency.

Bussan et al. discloses an alert transducer 104 that provides an alert to a user that an incoming call is being received. See, e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 41 et seq. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Bussan et al. of controlling the alert transducer in the manner recited in claim 1. In particular, claim 1 involves a controller that controls the notification device (e.g., at least tone information, at least visible information) in dependence on the status (e.g., call holding, on-call) of a second line. No such controller is disclosed or suggested by Bussan et al. Indeed, there is no disclosure or even suggestion in Bussan et al. of controlling a notification device in dependence on the status of a communication line other than the communication line

on which the incoming call is detected. Thus, Bussan et al. cannot possibly remedy the acknowledged deficiencies of Tsutsui et al.

Claim 12 is for a telephone control system, wherein if an incoming-call detector detects an incoming call signal on a second one of multiple communication lines and the status discriminator discriminates a call holding status for a first one of the communication lines, the controller controls the notification device to provide at least an aural incoming call notification. If the incoming-call detector detects an incoming call signal on the second one of the communication lines and the status discriminator discriminates an on-call status for the first one of the communication lines, the controller controls the notification device to provide at least a visual incoming call notification. As with claim 1, neither Tsutsui et al. nor Bussan et al. discloses or suggests controlling a notification device in dependence on the status of a communication line other than the communication line on which the incoming call is detected. Consequently, claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-16 patentably distinguish over the proposed combination of Tsutsui et al. and Bussan et al.

Claim 17 is for a telephone system, wherein if a master telephone set is engaged in a call over a first one of a plurality of communication lines and an incoming call detector detects an incoming call to the master telephone set on a second one of the communication lines, a notification device of the master telephone set provides at least a visual incoming call notification. If a call in which the master telephone set is engaged on a first one of the communication lines is on-hold and the incoming call detector detects an incoming call to the master telephone set on a second one of the communication lines, the notification device of the master telephone set provides at least an aural incoming notification. Here again, neither Tsutsui et al. nor Bussan et al. discloses or suggests a notification device that provides an aural or visual notification in dependence on the status of a communication line other than the line on which the incoming call is detected. Consequently, claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-19 patentably distinguish over the proposed combination of Tsutsui et al. and Bussan et al.

N. YOSHITANI

Application No. 10/649,955

Response to Office Action dated August 18, 2008.

The pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied document and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michael J. Shea

Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100